REMARKS

With the cancellation of claims 31, 32, 37, and 38 and the addition of claims 59 and 60, claims 20-30, 33-36, and 39-60 are now pending in the above-referenced application.

Claims 20-26, 29-37, 39, and 44-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,675,081 to Shuman et al. ("Shuman"). Claims 27, 28, 38, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuman. Applicants disagree with these rejections. A substantial difference of the present invention over Shuman is that graphic data is stored in a unit connected to the data bus, and are transmitted to the output unit. When considering the recitation of audio data in current claim 30, the Examiner stated that graphic data are also received according to the document of Shuman, are stored and transmitted via the data bus. The basis for the Examiner's assertion on this matter is the CCD sensor, shown in Figure 4 and referenced with reference numeral 202(6), as well as the place in the text in column 31, lines 8 to 14, in which it is pointed out in general that a travel path of the vehicle is stored. But Applicants submit that one cannot infer from this either the storage or altogether the receiving of the graphic data from the document of Shuman. The term "CCD" (charge-coupled device) only describes a light-sensitive semiconductor detector. Such a semiconductor detector is used in the field of camera technology, but may also be used simply to detect brightness information (for instance, day/night).In this context, it cannot be inferred from Shuman that the CCD chip in this case works as a camera device. At no place in Shuman can it be inferred that video takes of the vehicle surroundings are actually taken, processed and stored. Even from the place in the text cited by the Examiner it is only known that one may store a "history of the vehicle and vehicle environment". A hint that, instead of the history of the vehicle, one may store picture images of a camera cannot be inferred from this place in the text.

In supplement, Applicants point out that stationary graphic representations (by contrast to moving images) are to be understood by the term graphics data. In addition, graphics are generated by humans or by computation, and not by a measuring procedure (corresponding to a take by a camera). However, in contrast to graphics data, a camera generates video data which are transmitted as a data stream. Therefore, by referring to a camera, one cannot infer a hint that, instead of video data, stored graphic data are read out and transmitted via the data bus.

With regard to the current dependent claims, Applicants wish to point out the following:

On claim 34, the Examiner points out that a prioritization of a data transmission according to Shuman is known. However, claim 34 claims to allow a permission for a bus transmission and to transmit it via the data bus. This is how the transmission from the driver information device to the output device takes place. However, according to Shuman, data are only transmitted from a computer unit to a display. A prioritization of the data from the driver information device to an output unit is not shown. Rather, the sensors are simply in a position of transmitting the data for further processing, in parallel via numerous data connections. Therefore, claim 34 is not shown or made obvious by Shuman.

Claim 44 is also not anticipated by Shuman. Even though Shuman shows several data transmission channels, it does not show a separation in one data channel for commands and one data channel for the transmission of the output data. Thus, claim 44 can is not anticipated by Shuman.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

By: [illegible] (Reg. No. 41,172)

Dated: 2/22/04 By [signature]

Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200